

Remarks

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Vinod D. Patel for the telephonic interview on June 1, 2009. During the interview, distinctions between Claim 1 and the prior art were discussed.

5 For example, the lack of disclosure or suggestion in U.S. Patent 5,285,050 to Blackburn (“the Blackburn patent”) of a slide member that blocked the terminal plate from contacting the first electrode was discussed. Examiner Patel agreed that, as shown in Applicant’s Figure 3, a first portion 62 of the slide member 6 blocks the electrical connection, distinguishing Applicant’s invention over the Blackburn patent. All claims now include a similar limitation.

10 **Rejections based on 35 USC § 112**

In rejecting Claims 7-12, the Examiner stated that in Claim 7, the phrase “said portion of said slide member capable of moving out of interference with said connection when said slide member is not covering said ignition window” is not supported by disclosure. Applicant has amended Claim 7, rewording the offending phrase, to overcome the Examiner’s rejections.

15 Applicant believes that Claim 7, as amended, is in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant believes that Claims 8-12, as amended, are in condition for allowance as claims dependent on Claim 7.

Rejections based on 35 USC § 103

20 The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious and unpatentable over the Blackburn patent in view of and U.S. Patent 5,643,480 to Gustavsson *et al.* (“the Gustavsson patent”). As discussed above and shown in Applicant’s Figure 3, a first portion 62 of the slide member 6 blocks the electrical connection. Examiner Patel agreed that this is not disclosed in the Blackburn patent. Each of independent Claims 1 and 7 now include such a

distinguishing limitation. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the Blackburn patent in view of the Gustavsson patent for at least this reason. In addition, Applicant believes that Claims 2-6 and Claims 8-12, as amended, are in condition for allowance as claims dependent on Claims 1 and 7, respectively.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that, in light of the above, the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application and Claims 1-12 in condition for allowance. To clarify any outstanding issues, the examiner is invited to call the applicant's attorney at the number below.

5

Respectfully Submitted,

TROJAN LAW OFFICES

By

10

Dated: June 30, 2009

/R. Joseph Trojan/

R. Joseph Trojan

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 34,264

15

TROJAN LAW OFFICES
9250 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 325
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 777-8399
Fax: (310) 777-8348
Customer No. 23388
Deposit Acct. No. 500703

20